REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action of February 24, 2009. Claims 1, 10, 16, 19, 24-25, 27, and 29-32 have been amended, claims 4, 15, and 28 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-25, 27, and 29-32 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1, 3-9, 19, and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action contends that the claimed subject matter is directed towards a file handling system which is "nothing more than software components."

In response, independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to recite a processor--a hardware component--in order to address the Examiner's concerns. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 19, and 21-23 should be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 24-25 and 27-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action contends that the claimed subject matter pertains to a computer-readable storage medium which is defined to be a paper storage medium. Claims 24-25 and 27-32 have been amended to recite a computer diskette which is statutory subject matter and is disclosed in Applicant's specification. As a result, the rejection of claims 24-25 and 27-32 should be withdrawn.

3. <u>Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103</u>

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-19, 21-22, 24-25, and 27-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Persels* (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,547) in view of *Hashem* (U.S. Patent No. 7,155,578).

a. <u>Claim 1</u>

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

> A file handling system, comprising:
> a terminating file transfer server operable to receive a file transfer message from an originating file transfer server along with at least one file, the file transfer message including details about the transfer of said at least one file including a local user and at least one filename for said at least one file, ***the terminating file transfer server in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;***
> ***the agent operable to read the file transfer message received from the originating file transfer server, and direct the transfer of said at least one filename and said at least one file associated with said at least one filename to a home directory associated with the local user in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory; and***
> ***the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote host thereby allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "the terminating file transfer server in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; the agent operable to read the file transfer message received from the originating file transfer server, and direct the transfer of said at least one filename and said at least one file associated with said at least one filename to a home directory associated with the local user in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory; and the configuration file residing in the home directory,

and operable to instruct the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote host thereby allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Persels* describes that "the eFORWARD Server[SM] 12 will invoke an intermediate process specified below. Immediately upon receipt of the message by the eFORWARD server[SM] 12, the eFORWARD server[SM] 12 determines whether the partner eDIRECT[TM] is 'checked in' (i.e. listening). If so, contact with a listening eDIRECT client[SM] is attempted by sending a short message to the specified IP address and listening port. If a destination eDIRECT[SM] client responds, then the message is immediately delivered and so marked in the eFORWARD Server database 24. If the partner iBox[SM] eDIRECT client does not respond, then the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox[SM] eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery. An iBox eDIRECT Client is considered to be listening if it has sent the eFORWARD Server a message within the previous 'n' minutes advising it of the IP address and port number on which it is listening. The number of minutes, 'n', is an installation parameter." Col. 6, lines 6-24 (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, *Persels* requires an eDIRECT client to establish a local presence of the client on eFORWARD Server to initiate delivery of a file. As such, *Persels* does not disclose that a configuration file residing in a home directory comprises a host name and port name of the remote host where a file is transferred. As a result, *Persels* fails to teach or suggest at least "the terminating file transfer server in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; the agent operable to read the file transfer message received from the originating file transfer server, and direct the transfer of said at least one filename and said at least one file associated with said at least one filename to a home directory associated with the local user in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory; and the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent to,

10

after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote host thereby allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action contends that *Hashem* remedies the deficiencies of *Persels* in disclosing the features of claim 1. *Hashem* describes techniques for transferring files from a first location to a second location. *Hashem* describes that a file may be placed in an outbasket at a first location and a process at the first location transfers the file to an inbasket at a second location. *See* Fig. 5.

For example, *Hashem* states that a "user will download files when a user needs to retrieve a file from another location, i.e., such as the remote entity 80. To perform such downloading, the user configures the system of the invention to indicate the locations where the files will be downloaded from. That is, the user configures the configuration parameters file 66 in the memory portion 60 to provide various associations between the various baskets. For example when uploading, a file that is placed in the internal outbasket 42 is transferred, based on the configuration information, to the external inbasket 87 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82. In a similar manner when downloading or retrieving--a file that is placed in the external outbasket 85 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82 may be configured for transfer to the internal inbasket 52, i.e., based on the configuration parameters that are stored in the configuration parameters file 66 in the FTP processing portion 10. That is, in accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the network interface portion 20 determines the source of a file upon receipt of a file. Based on the source, the network interface portion 20 places the file in an internal inbasket, i.e., based on the parameters in the configuration parameters file 66." Cols. 8-9, lines 47-2 (Emphasis added and indentation removed). Therefore, an internal inbasket appears to more akin to a home directory, using the language of claim 1, than to a remote host. It is noted that claim 1 requires a file to be received at a terminating file transfer server, transferred and stored in a home directory by an agent, and then transferred from the home directory to a

remote host as specified in a configuration file residing in the home directory. *Hashem* does not satisfy these requirements and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Persels*.

As such, *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "the terminating file transfer server in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; the agent operable to read the file transfer message received from the originating file transfer server, and direct the transfer of said at least one filename and said at least one file associated with said at least one filename to a home directory associated with the local user in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory; and the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote host thereby allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 3-9

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 3 and 5-9 depend from and include the features of claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 3 and 5-9 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Claim 4 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to the claim is rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

c. Claim 10

As provided in independent claim 10, Applicant claims:

A method of handling files on a Connect:Direct server, comprising:
receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer server at a terminating file transfer server;
in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;
determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message;
storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory;
retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and
transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Persels* describes that "the eFORWARD Server^{SM} 12 will invoke an intermediate process specified below. Immediately upon receipt of the message by the eFORWARD server^{SM} 12, the eFORWARD server^{SM} 12 determines whether the partner eDIRECT^{TM} is 'checked in' (i.e. listening). If so, contact with a listening eDIRECT client^{SM} is attempted by sending a short message to the specified IP address and listening port. If a destination eDIRECT^{SM} client responds, then the message is immediately delivered and so marked in the eFORWARD Server database

24. If the partner iBox^{SM} eDIRECT client does not respond, then the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox^{SM} eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery. An iBox eDIRECT Client is considered to be listening if it has sent the eFORWARD Server a message within the previous 'n' minutes advising it of the IP address and port number on which it is listening. The number of minutes, 'n', is an installation parameter." Col. 6, lines 6-24.

Accordingly, *Persels* requires an eDIRECT client to establish a local presence of the client on eFORWARD Server to initiate delivery of a file. As such, *Persels* does not disclose that a configuration file residing in a home directory comprises a host name and port name of the remote host where a file is transferred. As a result, *Persels* fails to teach or suggest at least "in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 10.

The Office Action contends that *Hashem* remedies the deficiencies of *Persels* in disclosing the features of claim 10. *Hashem* describes techniques for transferring files from a first location to a second location. *Hashem* describes that a file may be placed in an outbasket at a first location and a process at the first location transfers the file to an inbasket at a second location. *See* Fig. 5.

For example, *Hashem* states that a "user will download files when a user needs to retrieve a file from another location, i.e., such as the remote entity 80. To perform such downloading, the user configures the system of the invention to indicate the locations where the files will be downloaded from. That is, the user configures the configuration parameters file 66 in the memory portion 60 to provide various associations between the various baskets. For example when uploading, a file that is placed in the internal outbasket 42 is transferred, based on the configuration information, to the external inbasket 87 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82.

In a similar manner when downloading or retrieving--a file that is placed in the external outbasket 85 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82 may be configured for transfer to the internal inbasket 52, i.e., based on the configuration parameters that are stored in the configuration parameters file 66 in the FTP processing portion 10. That is, in accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the network interface portion 20 determines the source of a file upon receipt of a file. Based on the source, the network interface portion 20 places the file in an internal inbasket, i.e., based on the parameters in the configuration parameters file 66." Cols. 8-9, lines 47-2 (Indentation removed). Therefore, an internal inbasket appears to more akin to a home directory, using the language of claim 10, than to a remote host. It is noted that claim 10 requires a file to be received at a terminating file transfer server, transferred and stored in a home directory by an agent, and then transferred from the home directory to a remote host as specified in a configuration file residing in the home directory. *Hashem* does not satisfy these requirements and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Persels*.

As such, *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 11 and 13-18

For at least the reasons given above, claim 10 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 11, 13-14, and 16-18 depend from and include the features of claim 10 and recite additional features, claims 11, 13-14, and 16-18 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Claim 15 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to the claim is rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

e. Claim 19

As provided in independent claim 19, Applicant claims:

> A Connect:Direct file handling system, comprising:
> a terminating file transfer server;
> an agent; and
> a configuration file;
> *the terminating file transfer server being operable to launch the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local username and at least one filename, and the agent being operable to direct the transfer of and storage of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory associated with the username, the agent being further operable to read the configuration file, and transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified by the configuration file without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file server, wherein the configuration file is operable to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote host.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 19 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "the terminating file transfer server being operable to launch the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local username and at least one filename, and the agent being operable to direct the transfer of and storage of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory associated with the username, the agent being further operable to read the configuration file, and transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified by the configuration file without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating

16

file server, wherein the configuration file is operable to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote host," as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Persels* describes that "the eFORWARD Server[SM] 12 will invoke an intermediate process specified below. Immediately upon receipt of the message by the eFORWARD server[SM] 12, the eFORWARD server[SM] 12 determines whether the partner eDIRECT[TM] is 'checked in' (i.e. listening). If so, contact with a listening eDIRECT client[SM] is attempted by sending a short message to the specified IP address and listening port. If a destination eDIRECT[SM] client responds, then the message is immediately delivered and so marked in the eFORWARD Server database 24. If the partner iBox[SM] eDIRECT client does not respond, then the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox[SM] eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery. An iBox eDIRECT Client is considered to be listening if it has sent the eFORWARD Server a message within the previous 'n' minutes advising it of the IP address and port number on which it is listening. The number of minutes, 'n', is an installation parameter." Col. 6, lines 6-24.

Accordingly, *Persels* requires an eDIRECT client to establish a local presence of the client on eFORWARD Server to initiate delivery of a file. As such, *Persels* does not disclose that a configuration file residing in a home directory comprises a host name and port name of the remote host where a file is transferred. As a result, *Persels* fails to teach or suggest at least "the terminating file transfer server being operable to launch the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local username and at least one filename, and the agent being operable to direct the transfer of and storage of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory associated with the username, the agent being further operable to read the configuration file, and transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified by the configuration file without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file server, wherein the configuration file is operable to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote host," as recited in claim 19.

The Office Action contends that *Hashem* remedies the deficiencies of *Persels* in disclosing the features of claim 19. *Hashem* describes techniques for transferring files from a first location to a second location. *Hashem* describes that a file may be placed in

an outbasket at a first location and a process at the first location transfers the file to an inbasket at a second location. *See* Fig. 5.

For example, *Hashem* states that a "user will download files when a user needs to retrieve a file from another location, i.e., such as the remote entity 80. To perform such downloading, the user configures the system of the invention to indicate the locations where the files will be downloaded from. That is, the user configures the configuration parameters file 66 in the memory portion 60 to provide various associations between the various baskets. For example when uploading, a file that is placed in the internal outbasket 42 is transferred, based on the configuration information, to the external inbasket 87 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82. In a similar manner when downloading or retrieving--a file that is placed in the external outbasket 85 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82 may be configured for transfer to the internal inbasket 52, i.e., based on the configuration parameters that are stored in the configuration parameters file 66 in the FTP processing portion 10. That is, in accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the network interface portion 20 determines the source of a file upon receipt of a file. Based on the source, the network interface portion 20 places the file in an internal inbasket, i.e., based on the parameters in the configuration parameters file 66." Cols. 8-9, lines 47-2 (Indentation removed). Therefore, an internal inbasket appears to more akin to a home directory, using the language of claim 19, than to a remote host. It is noted that claim 19 requires a file to be received at a terminating file server, transferred and stored in a home directory by an agent, and then transferred from the home directory to a remote host as specified in a configuration file residing in the home directory. *Hashem* does not satisfy these requirements and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Persels*.

As such, *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "the terminating file transfer server being operable to launch the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local username and at least one filename, and the agent being operable to direct the transfer of and storage of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory associated with the username, the agent being further operable to read the configuration file, and transfer said at least one file from the home directory to a remote host specified by the

configuration file without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file server, wherein the configuration file is operable to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote host," as recited in claim 19.

Accordingly, claim 19 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem,* and the rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 21-23

For at least the reasons given above, claim 19 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 21-23 depend from and include the features of claim 19 and recite additional features, claims 21-23 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Further, with regard to claim 23, the Office Action states "it would have been well-known in the networking art to include a rename function into the system and method by Persels-Hashem. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable a user to indicate a preferred (e.g. more easily remembered) file name." Page 15. Applicant respectfully traverses the finding for at least the reason that the Office Action describes its rename function as being equivalent to a user manually selecting a file name. Page 15. However, this manual operation is not equivalent to "the file processor being operable to receive files via the port monitor, and assign said at least one filename to said at least one file received, respectively," as recited in claim 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it has not been established that a "the file processor being operable to receive files via the port monitor, and assign said at least one filename to said at least one file received, respectively," as described in claim 23, is capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.

g. Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicant claims:

A computer diskette having a program for handling files on a Connect:Direct server, wherein the computer diskette is a physical structure executed by a computer and the program is operable to perform:
receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer server at a terminating file transfer server;
in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;
determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message;
storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory;
retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and
transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as emphasized above.

In reviewing the reference, *Persels* describes that "the eFORWARD Server[SM] 12 will invoke an intermediate process specified below. Immediately upon receipt of the message by the eFORWARD server[SM] 12, the eFORWARD server[SM] 12 determines whether the partner eDIRECT[TM] is 'checked in' (i.e. listening). If so, contact with a listening eDIRECT client[SM] is attempted by sending a short message to the specified IP address and listening port. If a destination eDIRECT[SM] client responds, then the

message is immediately delivered and so marked in the eFORWARD Server database 24. If the partner iBox^{SM} eDIRECT client does not respond, then the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox^{SM} eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery. An iBox eDIRECT Client is considered to be listening if it has sent the eFORWARD Server a message within the previous 'n' minutes advising it of the IP address and port number on which it is listening. The number of minutes, 'n', is an installation parameter." Col. 6, lines 6-24.

Accordingly, *Persels* requires an eDIRECT client to establish a local presence of the client on eFORWARD Server to initiate delivery of a file. As such, *Persels* does not disclose that a configuration file residing in a home directory comprises a host name and port name of the remote host where a file is transferred. As a result, *Persels* fails to teach or suggest at least "in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 24.

The Office Action contends that *Hashem* remedies the deficiencies of *Persels* in disclosing the features of claim 24. *Hashem* describes techniques for transferring files from a first location to a second location. *Hashem* describes that a file may be placed in an outbasket at a first location and a process at the first location transfers the file to an inbasket at a second location. *See* Fig. 5.

For example, *Hashem* states that a "user will download files when a user needs to retrieve a file from another location, i.e., such as the remote entity 80. To perform such downloading, the user configures the system of the invention to indicate the locations where the files will be downloaded from. That is, the user configures the configuration parameters file 66 in the memory portion 60 to provide various associations between the various baskets. For example when uploading, a file that is placed in the internal outbasket 42 is transferred, based on the configuration

information, to the external inbasket 87 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82. In a similar manner when downloading or retrieving--a file that is placed in the external outbasket 85 in the remote entity FTP processing portion 82 may be configured for transfer to the internal inbasket 52, i.e., based on the configuration parameters that are stored in the configuration parameters file 66 in the FTP processing portion 10. That is, in accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the network interface portion 20 determines the source of a file upon receipt of a file. Based on the source, the network interface portion 20 places the file in an internal inbasket, i.e., based on the parameters in the configuration parameters file 66." Cols. 8-9, lines 47-2 (Indentation removed). Therefore, an internal inbasket appears to more akin to a home directory, using the language of claim 24, than to a remote host. It is noted that claim 24 requires a file to be received at a terminating file transfer server, transferred and stored in a home directory by an agent, and then transferred from the home directory to a remote host as specified in a configuration file residing in the home directory. *Hashem* does not satisfy these requirements and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Persels*.

As such, *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent; determining, by the agent, a home directory from a local user associated with the file transfer message; storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory; retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote host; and transmitting, via the agent, said at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," as recited in claim 24.

Accordingly, claim 24 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn.

h. Claims 26-32

For at least the reasons given above, claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 25, 27, and 29-32 depend from and include the features of claim 24 and recite additional features, claims 25, 27, and 29-32 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

Claim 28 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to the claim is rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicant reserves the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicant. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_/Charles W. Griggers/_____

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

AT&T Legal Department – TKHR
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, NJ 07921
Customer No.: **38823**